

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
Wheeling**

PAUL BELL,

Petitioner,

v.

**Civil Action No. 5:22-CV-292
Judge Bailey**

WARDEN ROANE,

Respondent.

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

The above referenced case is before this Court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation that the petition be denied and dismissed without prejudice.

This Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, absent prompt objection by a dissatisfied party, it appears that Congress did not intend for the district court to review the factual and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge. ***Thomas v. Arn***, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Additionally, any party who fails to file timely, written objections to the magistrate judge's report pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) waives the right to raise those objections at the appellate court level. ***United States v. Schronce***, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984). No objections have been filed to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation.

A *de novo* review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge's report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. Accordingly, the magistrate judge's report and recommendation [Doc. 5] is **ADOPTED**, and petitioner's Petition for Habeas Corpus Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [Doc. 1] is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to any counsel of record and to mail a copy to the *pro se* petitioner.

DATED: May 18, 2023.



JOHN PRESTON BAILEY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE